

174



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,267	05/08/2001	Leland R. Beaumont	1-7-1-1	2972

7590 12/09/2004

Docket Administrator (Room 3C-512)
 Lucent Technologies Inc.
 600 Mountain Avenue
 P.O. Box 636
 Murray Hill, NJ 07974-0636

EXAMINER

HU, JINSONG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/851,267

Applicant(s)

BEAUMONT ET AL.

Examiner

Jinsong Hu

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 19-31 are presented for examination based on applicant's restriction requirement response filed on 9/27/04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 19-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahuja et al. (US 6,175,869).
4. As per claims 19 and 20, Ahuja teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a computer program product having a computer readable medium having computer program logic recorded thereon for mapping an input name into an address upon a request from a requester [col. 2, lines 16-25], the computer program product comprising a receiving program code segment for causing a computer to receive the input name from the request [100, Fig. 4; col. 4, lines 64 – col. 5, line 8; col. 7, lines 31-36] and a mapping program code segment for causing the computer to map the input name against a mapping database for mapping a name to an address wherein at least

Art Unit: 2154

one name is mapped to more than one address, the mapping program code segment also for causing the computer to retrieve from the mapping database all addresses mapped to the input name [col. 6, lines 25-40; col. 7, lines 12-30]. Ahuja also teaches selecting one of retrieved address from the database based on calculating results [P_{mi} i.e., preference number] of performance statistics, site-specification information etc. [col. 5, line 46- col. 6, line 8; col. 7, lines 44-49; 108, Fig.4] and returning to the requester a response comprising the selected retrieved mapped address [col. 7, lines 49-51].

5. Ahuja does not specifically teach storing preference number associated with each mapped address in database. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store preference number in Ahuja's system because doing so would simplify the server selecting procedure by avoiding calculating for each of server selecting decision. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Ahuja's system to improve the efficiency of entire system.

6. As per claims 21, Ahuja teaches dynamically assigning a time-to-live (TTL) value to each entry in the preference database associated with the requester identifier [col. 5, line 50 – col. 6, line 8].

7. As per claims 22-24, Ahuja teaches dynamically assigns a TTL value to an entry in the preference database table associated with the selected mapped address, as a

Art Unit: 2154

function of the preference number in that entry or directly related to that entry's preference number [col. 2, lines 25-42; col. 5, lines 44-49].

8. As per claim 25, Ahuja teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 19. Ahuja does not specifically teach considering an estimated distance between the retrieved mapped address and the requester. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to consider distance between the mapped address and the requester because doing so would improve the functionality and reliability of the system by providing service to the requester from the closest server. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Ahuja's system with distance considering step to improve the performance of the system.

9. As per claims 26-31, they are method claims of claims 19-25, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 19-25 above.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Kenner et al. (US 6,112,239) discloses a deliver system;

Watson (US 6,223,209) discloses a distributed web service system;

Herzog et al. (US 6,425,003) discloses a DNS resolution system;

Art Unit: 2154

Deen et al. (US 6,629,127) discloses a http processing system; and

Swildens et al. (US 6,694,358) discloses a DNS network.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3965.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jinsong Hu

December 1, 2004


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100